

REMARKS

By the above actions, all of the claims have been amended. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested.

At the outset, the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter with respect to all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-22 24, & 25 is acknowledged with appreciation. Thus, every effort has been made to address all of the formal matters raised by the Examiner in order that this application may proceed to issuance as a patent.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the claims for failing to provide antecedent basis for the "means for measuring static pressure" of original claim 1, it is noted that such antecedent basis can be found in the first paragraph of the specification. Furthermore, the use of pressure measurements is mentioned in a number of other places throughout the specification. However, since this "means" terminology is not defined, and since the manner of monitoring the pressure in the cuff is well known and by itself forms no part of the present invention, claim 1 has been amended to replace the means plus function language with the recitation of a "a detector for providing measurements of slowly varying static pressures in said sleeve or cuff," language which conforms with the language of claim 6 and as used in describing the invention, for example, in the paragraph spanning pages 3 & 4 of the specification. Accordingly, this objection should now be withdrawn.

The Examiner raised a number of objections to the claims and each of them has been addressed by the above amendments, in most cases, using the language proposed by the Examiner. Thus, the objections to the claims should now be withdrawn and such action is requested.


All of the claims were rejected under § 112 for indefiniteness due to the reference to a "universal joint type support" and the Examiner indicated that the term was being construed to require a universal joint as contrasted with a structure similar to a universal joint. However, as can be seen from page 3, lines 11-13, a "universal type joint" is defined as being one which provides support for a linear array perpendicular to an axis "by permitting movement in a plane perpendicular to said axis as well as rotation about an axis along the linear array." Furthermore, the specification makes it clear that a "universal type joint" is not a universal joint, but rather merely "emulates" a conventional universal joint (page 7, lines 20

& 28; claims 21 & 22) and can be such diverse structures as a foam pad (page 9, last line and claim 21) and an air cushion (page 10, lines 7 & 8 and claim 22). Thus, since an applicant is permitted to be his/her own lexicographer, the use of the terminology "universal joint type support" should not have been found indefinite since is defined in the specification and should not have been construed as requiring an universal joint, especially since such is inconsistent with the recitations of claims 21 & 22. However, to advance the prosecution, this language has been changed to a "joint support which emulates a universal joint." Such language is consistent with the noted language of the specification and claims and cannot be considered indefinite. Therefore, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is in order and is hereby requested.

As for the rejection under § 101 for the recitation of parts of a human body, claims 1 and 5 have been amended along the lines suggested by the Examiner so as to only recited parts of a human body from the standpoint of functions that the invention is "adapted" to perform "in use." Therefore, withdrawn of this rejection is also in order and now requested.

Since all of the formal issues have been resolved and the claims have otherwise been found to contain patentable subject matter, this application should now be in condition for allowance and formal notice of this fact is requested. However, while this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

Customer No. 25570
Roberts Mlotkowski & Hobbes P.C.
P.O. Box 10064
McLean, VA 22102
Direct Telephone: (703) 584-3273

DSS:st